

COLLABORATION AND PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

By

Theresa Blaylock

A Program Analysis

Presented to the

Faculty of the Department of Public Policy and Administration

School of Business and Public Administration

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, BAKERSFIELD

In Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

June 2011

Copyright

By

Theresa Blaylock

2011

Collaboration and Program Effectiveness

By Theresa Blaylock

This thesis or project has been accepted on behalf of the Department of Public Policy and Administration by their supervisory committee:



4/20/2012

R. Steven Daniels, Ph.D.
First Reader



4/23/2012

Chandra Commuri, Ph.D.
Second Reader

I dedicate this paper to my daughters

Jessica and Maria

The light in my life

Table of Contents

Chapter 1 -Introduction	Pg 0
Background	Pg 1
Statement of the Problem	Pg 5
Chapter 2 -Literature Review	Pg 7
Juvenile Offender Statistics	Pg 7
Effective Programs for Juvenile Offenders	Pg 8
CPAI as a Measure	Pg 9
Collaboration	Pg 10
Chapter 3 –Methodology	Pg 12
Participants	Pg 13
Procedure.....	Pg 14
Chapter 4 –Results.....	Pg 16
Importance of Study.....	Pg 18
Chapter 5 –Summery.....	Pg 19
References	Pg 21

List of Tables

Table 1. CPAI Score for Los Angeles County Youth Offender Programs Pg 14

**Table 2. Significance of Collaboration Intervention in Los Angeles County Youth
Offenders Programs Pg 16**

Table 3. Change in CPAI Score for Los Angeles County Youth Offender Programs ... Pg 17

Collaboration and Program Effectiveness

Chapter 1 -Introduction

Corrections policy has always vacillated between rehabilitation and deterrence/punishment as appropriate models for the treatment of those convicted of crimes. The United States used rehabilitation from the early 1900s until the 1970s. The dilemma faced in the 1970s was that some questioned whether the current rehabilitation model was working. Many correctional programs were not showing consistent effective reduction of recidivism. The policy then shifted to deterrence/punishment model. The effects of this were increases in recidivism rates (U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2004). This left many questioning whether any correctional strategy works. From that question, a few scholars took on the challenge of verifying what works in rehabilitation, with which offenders, and when is it most effective. This led to the “what works” movement in rehabilitation (Andrews, Zinger, Hoge, Bonta, Gendreau, & Cullen, 1990).

From that early work, the discovery of what works became definable and measurable. This is using a tool known as the principles of effective intervention (POEI) (Gendreau, Little, Goggen, 1996). The POEI measures the “risk and needs” level of the offender and the “responsivity” of the offender. Once POEI measures the offender, the program uses the cognitive behavioral method of treatment.

The next step was to assess the effectiveness of each individual program by measuring the program and the program’s adherence to the POEI. Using the correctional program assessment inventory (CPAI) to measure the level of adherence to the POEI, it was possible to measure which programs reduce recidivism rates (Gendreau & Andrews, Correctional Program Assessment Inventory (4th ed.), 1994) (Gendreau & Andrews, Correctional Program Assessment

Inventory (4th ed.), 1994). The next step was to verify consistency in effective program implementation. This paper investigates whether collaboration enhances program effectiveness. This collaboration would be between scholars (trained in the use of CPAI) and offender program providers.

Background

A change in policy took place in the 1970s that adversely affected the offenders, government agencies, and society. That policy shift was the “get tough on crime” policy.

Crime rates and incarceration rates up into the 1970s were consistent at around 100 per 100,000 individuals (U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2004). This would fluctuate slightly following events that affected society as a whole, like World War II. The resulting change the get-tough policy shift had on society, politics, the criminal justice system, and the offenders was to turn correctional policy away from rehabilitation and toward a deterrence approach to corrections. The outcome of this has been a 920% increase in the incarceration rate from 1975 to today. This shift overpopulated prisons, increased correctional budgets, and helped bankrupt states (U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2004).

The get-tough policy did not respond to crime rates. In essence, from 1975 to today, the crime rates continue to fluctuate rising and then falling as they did prior to 1975; the change is only in the incarceration rate, and more specifically the rate of recidivism. In other words, the crime rate did not go down because of incarceration. The resulting get-tough policy as manifested affected recidivism, but not crime. It did not show a decrease in crime as corrections increased incarceration. Today, the incarceration rate continues to go up (U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2004). Therefore, the get-tough policy of crime control and

public safety is not reducing crime. While correctional policy shifted away from rehabilitation toward deterrence, some researchers held out that rehabilitation still held promise. Deterrence was not working. Many saw the weaknesses in the new policy as justification to continue to pursue rehabilitation. The question posed at the time was, “what works, with whom and when” (Palmer, 1975)

A natural next step was to discover which programs worked and why and with which offenders these programs work and why. Once this was established, correctional programs could recreate effective interventions and build upon them to better society’s response to recidivism, (Andrews, Zinger, Hoge, Bonta, Gendreau, & Cullen, 1990)

The POEI measures the Risk-Need-Responsivity of the offender. The POEI measures the seven key elements in criminogenic indicators (criminogenic refers to criminal activities). The criminogenic indicators are in order of importance, Attitude, Associates, Personality, Criminal History, Family, Education/Employment, and finally Addictions. Once these levels are measured, it is possible to separate out the high risk offenders from the low risk offenders. The research found that working with the high-risk offenders shows more promise in effective reduction in recidivism. On the contrary, working with low-risk offenders shows an increase in offender’s criminogenic behaviors. In other words, removing low-risk offenders from their daily lives marginalizes previously stable people within the community and destabilizes the community they come from (Snyder & Stinchcomb, 2006). This research also discovered mixing low-risk offenders with high-risk offenders taught low-risk offenders how to be high-risk offenders. This is counter to the desired outcome of all stakeholders’ perspective of crime control and public safety, (Gendreau, Little, & Goggen, A meta-analysis of the predictors of adult offender recidivism: What works, 1996).

The Principles of Effective Intervention show promise for effectively reducing recidivism rates. When followed correctly, the program uses the Cognitive-Behavioral model of treatment. The rate of success supports rehabilitation as effective in the reduction of recidivism. This rehabilitation model works and it is measurable (Gendreau & Andrews, 1994).

Once the model established “what works”, it became necessary to measure and track which programs work. The measure of program effectiveness used the Correctional Program Assessment Inventory, (CPAI) (Gendreau & Andrews, Correctional Program Assessment Inventory (4th ed.), 1994) (Gendreau & Andrews, Correctional Program Assessment Inventory (4th ed.), 1994). Utilizing this measure can work toward delivery of service with the assurance of treatment the program is providing is the most effective. Ineffective programs that show an increase in recidivism are not just a waste of taxpayer’s money but also harmful to the life of the offender. This works on all levels for all stakeholders (Gendreau, Goggin, Cullen, & Andrews, 2000).

The CPAI measures the program’s implementation, client assessment, program characteristics, staff characteristics and evaluation. Measuring these aspects of a program identifies level of integrity. Adherence to the POEI shows a reduction in recidivism; measuring programs adherence to the POEI becomes necessary through use of the CPAI. We now have a measure for which program (POEI) and which offenders (High-risk) it works.

Despite this knowledge, the United States continues to use deterrence. Deterrence in the form used today shows a measurable increase in recidivism (Gendreau, Goggin, Cullen, & Andrews, 2000). The research suggests that POEI and CPAI identify effective models of rehabilitation. The shift from deterrence to an effective model saves money and lives.

Therefore, the first three steps to effective correctional policy are, first, identifying the need for effective intervention; second, discovering what works; and third, evaluating the programs for adherence to what we know works. The final piece to this dilemma is to add collaboration to the model of what works. This paper hypothesizes that collaboration between scholars and practitioners delivering treatment to youth offenders can increase program effectiveness. The added element of collaboration creates an ongoing measure of offender programs.

Existing data support the validity of collaboration. Collaboration will reduce recidivism rates. This is important for all offenders in the criminal justice system whether men, women or youths. Collaboration will move the offender programs to measured programs functioning effectively.

Youth carry an added element of complexity in the criminal justice system, as well as societal implications. The prevalence of youth gangs and youth gang violence is troubling to most major cities as well as many of the smaller communities. Los Angeles, labeled the Gang capital of the world, is working toward answers to its high rate of youth gangs. Addressing the issue of gangs and the violence that so often goes with them is a major concern to the criminal justice system. Research in this area has shown promise of use of the POEI in effecting change in gang members and working toward reducing the recidivism rate of this highly problematic population.

Gangs and gang crime is not what is portrayed in the media. Many assume gangs commit a high rate of the crimes in cities. Crimes such as burglaries, robberies, rape, and other part I offenses, link to gangs and gang members only 1% of the time (US department of Justice, 2011). This would indicate gangs are not the criminal element in society seen through the media. The

most prominent crime committed by gang members is homicide (20% of all homicides). When looked at closely, though, the statistics reveal that most gang homicides are intraracial, (gang member on gang member of the same race), not, as most fear, gang members randomly targeting strangers (U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2004).

Statement of the problem

The problem is the effectiveness of youth-offender programs. To gain consistent program outcomes that reduce recidivism rates there, the criminal justice system needs accurate measures of successful rehabilitation. Today youth-offender programs are not all effective in their treatment of youth offenders. When a youth comes in to the juvenile system, it is an opportunity to effect change and proactively prevent recidivism. Youth-offender programs that are not effective are causing harm to both the youth-offender and to the government or financial backer of that program to effect a decrease in youth-offender recidivism. The harm poor-quality youth-offender programs cause is in the youth-offender's giving up on the idea of a life free of criminal activity. Further harm is in government budgeted funding to programs that are not producing a reduction in recidivism. This includes nonprofit agencies taking donated money for the benefit of youth offenders. Programs not reducing recidivism are causing further harm to the public perception of the troubled youth that are in these programs.

Youth-offender programs need measures to guarantee effectiveness. Collaboration between scholars and program providers may provide the link to effectiveness. This paper then measures the value of collaboration for improving program effectiveness. Collaboration is the theoretical approach to increase program effectiveness.

Treatment programs for the youth-offender population charged with reducing the criminogenic behaviors of the youth-offender need validation through measuring effectiveness.

Programs following a model that is not reducing criminogenic behavior are in effect increasing crime. The measure of these programs can empirically validate if change is happening and if it reduces recidivism. Without ongoing measures, a program that is once meeting the goal can have a shift that changes the outcome, and the administrators of these programs may not even know.

It is the contention of this investigation that collaboration can improve criminal justice programs responsible for addressing the criminogenic behaviors for youths in the juvenile justice system. This enhances public safety as well as being fiducially responsible. By teaching professionals the theory and practice behind what is effective at achieving behavioral change, the model moves the youth-offender programs to one of measurable success with ongoing critique.

Chapter 2 -Literature Review

The following chapter traces the relevant literature on youth offenders, effective youth-offender programs, the CPAI as a measure of those programs, and collaboration. The subject of collaboration for increasing effective youth-offender intervention looks at the statistics of youth offending. This puts into perspective the scope of the problem and makes relevant actual crime trends.

After the brief look at the trends of juvenile offending, the next section will discuss the theory of treatment of Principles of Effective Intervention (POEI) and the use of the Correctional Program Assessment Inventory (CPAI) as a proxy measure of the effectiveness in the reduction of youth-offender recidivism. The literature review explores meta-analyses, literature, and studies that support the effects of this theory.

Finally, the section that brings these together is to assess the effectiveness of collaboration. It is the hypothesis of this paper that the key to effective youth-offender programs is collaboration. This collaboration takes place between those practitioners delivering the treatment at the program level and academics or researchers who have the skill and training on the CPAI. The scholars will effectively measure using the CPAI and give feedback to the program providers. This provides help to the program, and maintains levels of functioning in a method that provides the results desired of a reduction in youth-offender recidivism.

Juvenile Offender Statistics

This section discusses briefly the juvenile crime data. These will include gang activity and general crime trends. The statistical information accessed is through national criminal justice and juvenile justice crime databases.

In generally, violent crimes by gang members only made up 2—6% of all violent crimes. Although they represent such a small portion of the violent index I crimes, often the assumption is that gang members are responsible for much more of the violent crime in the United States, (Sheldon, Tracy, & Brown, 2004). This means focusing on gang members misrepresents violent crime. This is contrary to common beliefs. The media promotes the belief that youth gang members are wreaking havoc and raising their own crime wave across the country.

Looking at the statistics for violence, the media promotes the myth of gang members randomly murdering innocent citizens, (Reiman, 2007). The statistics do not support this myth. Gang members commit 30% of the aggravated battery. This is an over representation of their demographics. However, 98% of gang crimes occur against gang members of the same race or ethnicity (U.S. Department of Justice, 2011). Although gang members' killing each other is not acceptable, it does not support the myth of gang members killing randomly.

In the area of drugs and drug sales is the biggest deviation from commonly held beliefs. Gang members represent 2 – 8% of the felony drug charges (variation is due to type of felony drug charge). Putting this all into perspective, gangs are clearly not what the myth represents. Gangs most often are young males banding together for protection and companionship. Gangs may increase frequency but not the severity of crime (Sheldon, Tracy, & Brown, 2004). In other words, gangs do not make murderers out of car thieves.

Effective Programs for Juvenile Offenders

Programs providing treatment to the offender population are wide ranging and vary in scope from “get tough” to “finding the Lord” to “hitting bottom” to embracing their “inner child.” All of these have two things in common, they lack scientific validity and they have supporters that will swear by their effectiveness.

Researchers such as Palmer (1975) and Gendreau, Andrews and Bonta (1979, 1990 & 1994) have published the findings of their years of extensive research into what effectively works with offender populations. Working from General Social Learning theory, the researchers developed the key elements of POEI in measuring and effecting change in the offender population, (Andrews, Zinger, Hoge, Bonta, Gendreau, & Cullen, 1990).

Palmer's article (1975) substantiates his theory of what works, with whom it works, and why. This beginning led to the Principles of Effective Intervention (POEI) by Gendreau (1979).

From the Andrews et al article (1990), they utilize meta-analysis to substantiate the principles of effective intervention. In their research, the outcome shows that many of the treatments commonly relied on today and supported with taxpayer funding actually show an increase in recidivism. These are programs like "scared straight," "incarceration," "drug testing," and "intermittent incarceration." The article goes on to outline what the research substantiates, which is that the POEI is an effective evaluation tool for offender rehabilitation programs (Andrews, Zinger, Hoge, Bonta, Gendreau, & Cullen, 1990). Further supporting this research and meta-analysis is the Gendreau et al article in 2000. The Gendreau et al article shows certain forms of correcting do not correct, but rather increase recidivism (Gendreau, Goggin, Cullen, & Andrews, 2000).

Gendreau and Andrews (1994) took "what works" of effective intervention and then developed the next measure necessary to address the question of verifiability and validity. This is the measure of programs themselves to measure adherence to the model of corrective treatment.

CPAI as a Measure

To measure program effectiveness, Gendreau, and Andrews (1994) developed the Correctional Program Assessment Inventory (CPAI). Using what they learned about effective treatment programs as to what effects the change in criminogenic behavior with the highest success rate, Gendreau and Andrews were able to show results that other researchers have since substantiated.

In their article Flores, Russell, Latessa and Travis (2005) address the issue of professional quackery for programs that fail to measure their results. Too often, the target population takes the blame for the failure of the treatment. In other words, if a youth offender recidivates he is the failure. It would be the same if the doctor blamed the patient for the cancer treatment that failed. The article goes on to challenge treatment programs to adhere to the POEI. Flores' et al research outline their study that found a high incidence of practitioners who could not identify what the Risk and Need levels are of the population they are working with. Further, these practitioners often lacked understanding of the relevance of cognitive behavioral treatment. This research included the measure of practitioners in the sample population who held higher educational degrees. These programs measured using the CPAI showed decreased scores. These scores are proxy measures of program effectiveness. Program effectiveness is a measure of a reduction in recidivism rate.

Collaboration

What works in offender treatment programs, with whom, and when, is important to continuously measure using collaboration. This helps programs increase their effectiveness by decreasing the rates of recidivism in the target population. Collaboration also maintains effectiveness by continuously measuring and providing feedback by scholars to practitioners. These scholars grounded in their study of criminal behavior can increase program effectiveness.

Gendreau, Goggin, and Smith in their article (2004) discuss the obstacle to collaboration. Gendreau et al cite six key elements to barriers between the practitioners and academics. Those barriers are theoreticism, paradigm passion, knowledge destruction, the MBA management syndrome, technology transfer, and training.

The issues Gendreau, Goggin and Smith (2004) identify in their article support the need for adherence to the risk/need responsivity measure. Those needs identified, practitioners need to follow cognitive behavioral treatment. This is the POEI. Utilizing the CPAI as a means of measuring the effectiveness of the treatment program supports the validity and verifies the program effectiveness (Gendreau, Goggen, & Smith, *Obstacles to Effective Correctional Program Delivery*, 2004).

Others in the correctional field support the need for collaboration. In their article Sperber, Henderson-Hurly and Hanlry (2005) “challenge both sides to step out of their comfort zone.”

This paper intends to research the question whether the same level of collaboration used in the adult-offender programs works as effectively for the youth-offender programs. The study will compare the effectiveness of eight programs. Four randomly selected for collaboration and four measured at the beginning of the study but then left alone to follow their own implementation of treatment as a control. It is the hypothesis of this author that the effects of collaboration on the youth-offender programs will increase effectiveness. This increase in effectiveness will further verify the validity of collaboration. This will support the hypothesis; collaboration increases effectiveness in the youth-offender programs.

Chapter 3 -Methodology

The main research question is “Does a relationship exist between collaboration and program effectiveness?” Previous research indicates that certain types of interventions are more effective than other types of interventions in reducing recidivism rates (Gendreau, Little, & Goggen, A meta-analysis of the predictors of adult offender recidivism: What works, 1996). However, few studies have provided strong evidence of the empirical link between collaboration and program effectiveness. This study will provide empirical analyses of the relation between dimensions of collaboration and program effectiveness as measured by the CPAI.

To answer this question, this researcher accessed data on collaboration and program effectiveness. Using this previously collected data (Flores, 2004); this paper relied on secondary analysis. This previous researcher used an experimental research design. Data were collected on eight youth-offender programs in the Los Angeles, CA area. The Los Angeles county probation department requested this evaluation with the programs involved.

Eight programs were included in the study. Those eight programs treated 60 youth offenders each. These youth offenders were exclusively male, although this experiment should have implications for female youth offenders as well. The program provided six service hours for each of the youth offenders per week by the program as a part of the programs services. The youth offenders in the programs were made of youths adjudicated as delinquents (intervention) or identified as at risk (prevention). The programs did not distinguish between the two.

To develop data on program effectiveness, an individual trained in the application of the CPAI conducted site visits to each program for the initial measure (Flores, 2004). Many of the program characteristics included on the CPAI was scored for each program based on interviews

with the program directors and a review of relevant program material. Additional data on program effectiveness were gathered from surveys completed by the staff at each program.

The question “does the evidence support collaboration between Practitioners and Scholars increase the effectiveness in youth-offender treatment programs” is what this paper seeks to answer. To answer this, the research tests the dichotomous independent variable, collaboration (measured as the presence or absence of monthly research assistance against the improvement in program integrity (measured using the metric CPAI score).

The initial measure was taken at the beginning of fiscal year 2004. Then, utilizing random selection chose four programs for collaboration and four for control. The four that received collaboration were scored, and then a monthly follow up visit took place for the year of the experiment. Monthly visits allowed the opportunity to address any weaknesses that exist or may develop. The control group programs were also scored initially at the beginning of the fiscal year 2004. These control groups were given the opportunity to request collaboration at any time. None did. Then at the end of one year, measures were taken again on all programs (see scores in table #1).

Participants

Los Angeles Probation department selected eight juvenile offender treatment programs to be included in this study. All are within the greater Los Angeles area and funded by the county. The eight-gang intervention-prevention programs served 60 juveniles each, over a one-year period. Services involved six service hours per week, delivered according to each program treatment model. The program referrals based on Los Angeles County probation according to youths adjudicated as delinquents (intervention) or youths identified as at risk (prevention). The programs did not distinguish between the two.

The eight programs in the study group were as follows:

Table 4. CPAI Score for Los Angeles County Youth Offender Programs

Name of Youth-offender Program	Selected for collaboration Y/N	Change in Score from initial to final
Art Share	Yes	+11.4
El Centro Del Pueblo	Yes	+21
JADE (Juvenile Assistance Diversion Efforts)	Yes	+27
LEADS (Leadership Education and Advocacy Development Services)	No	-5
OSC (Our Savior Center)	Yes	+28
SCALE (School, Community, and Law Enforcement)	No	-1
SIPA (Search to Involve Pilipino Americans)	No	+3
Spiritt	No	+2

Procedure

Using random selection four programs selected for collaboration and four selected for a control receiving no follow up support. First, all eight programs were trained in the Principles of Effective Intervention (POEI) and then scored using the method previously described.

Next, the four programs selected for collaboration receive follow up on a monthly basis by a researcher trained in measuring program adherence to the POEI using the CPAI to score the programs and give follow up assessment to the program director for implementation of recommendations based on awareness of areas that become weak in adherence to the POEI.

At the end of the year, all the programs were re-measured using the CPAI. The measures of the programs produced scores supporting the hypothesis. Program effectiveness measured using CPAI for adherence to the POEI enhances when collaboration is utilized linking

practitioners and scholars.

Chapter 4 -Results

The results of the study show an increase in effectiveness when there is an increased adherence to the POEI. This measured by the CPAI is a proxy measure of program effectiveness. Of the eight programs, the four that were in randomly selected groups received collaboration. Their scores increased. The scores of the control group remained relatively the same.

Table 5. Significance of Collaboration Intervention in Los Angeles County Youth Offenders Programs

Four Intervention programs	Yes	Mean Change in CPAI	+21.7
Four Control programs	No	Mean Change in CPAI	+ 2.1
Significance of Difference	Significant: p <.01		

These findings suggest that collaboration can increase the program’s effectiveness. The implication of increased effectiveness of the programs for the youth offenders are reduced recidivism back to criminal activities. This is beneficial for the youths at this stage of their lives to get off probation or adjudication before adults and leave their juvenile record behind. This opens possibilities for employment and educational opportunities denied them otherwise.

Table 6. Change in CPAI Score for Los Angeles County Youth Offender Programs

<i>Program</i>	<i>Implementation Score</i>		<i>Assessment Score</i>		<i>Treatment Score</i>		<i>Staff Score</i>		<i>Evaluation Score</i>		<i>Other Score</i>		<i>Overall CPAI Score</i>	
	<i>Initial</i>	<i>Follow up</i>	<i>Initial</i>	<i>Follow up</i>	<i>Initial</i>	<i>Follow up</i>	<i>Initial</i>	<i>Follow up</i>	<i>Initial</i>	<i>Follow up</i>	<i>Initial</i>	<i>Follow up</i>	<i>Initial</i>	<i>Follow up</i>
Art Share	78.60	92.90	66.70	75.00	27.30	50.00	63.60	63.60	50.00	50.00	100.00	100.00	56.70	68.10
El Centro Del Pueblo	71.00	71.00	33.00	83.30	31.00	45.50	42.00	63.60	14.00	28.60	100.00	100.00	45.00	66.00
JADE (Juvenile Assistance Diversion Effort)	64.30	92.90	18.20	75.00	13.60	50.00	75.00	75.00	28.60	42.90	83.30	100.00	41.70	68.10
LEADS (Leadership Education and Advocacy Development Services)	71.40	85.70	54.50	54.60	45.50	22.70	50.00	50.00	33.30	16.70	83.30	83.30	54.90	49.30
OSC (Our Savior Center)	84.60	100.00	66.70	100.00	70.00	100.00	81.80	100.00	75.00	100.00	83.30	100.00	72.00	100.0
scale (School, Community, and Law Enforcement)	64.30	64.30	18.20	75.00	9.10	13.60	91.70	83.30	42.90	42.90	100.00	100.00	45.80	54.80
SIPA (Search to Involve Pilipino Americans)	71.40	78.60	33.30	33.30	4.60	9.10	66.70	75.00	28.60	28.60	100.00	100.00	43.50	46.50
Spiritt	69.20	76.90	50.00	50.00	40.00	40.00	72.70	72.70	75.00	75.00	73.50	73.50	66.00	68.00

Importance of the Study

This study is important for many reasons. First, the samples used in the research comprise youth offenders. Given the current focus on offender recidivism, these youths represent potential future adult offenders. This research is timely and relevant with current budget issues and prison overcrowding. Second, this research focuses on the positive effects of collaboration.

Collaboration is important to maintain and guarantee program effectiveness. Without measures of program effectiveness, programs are at risk of exaggerated findings and overstated effects, as two previous relevant articles point out (Latessa, Cullen, & Gendreau, 2002; Flores, Russell, Latessa, & Travis, 2005). Lastly, this research provides significant evidence for policy makers and funding sources when making decisions regarding offender rehabilitation programs.

Deterrence does not deter. Rehabilitation does rehabilitate. The link between scholars and the therapeutic community working together shows an ongoing improvement that has not yet seen its full potential. Corrections should at least correct.

Chapter 5 –Summary

The research suggests that only those programs that incorporated collaboration worked effectively to reduce rates of recidivism. Collaboration assists with addressing program weaknesses. This helps hold programs on task in the mission of reducing criminogenic behaviors and attitudes. From this limited study, it is apparent that there is promise in the theory supporting collaboration. Expanding on this study outside Los Angeles and with larger numbers of programs in the research group seems an inevitable next step. It is imperative to measure programs targeting populations that are limited in their ability to advocate or understand the quality of the treatment provided. In this study, the youth offenders, mostly adjudicated as delinquents, and some identified as at risk, are mandated with legal sanctions to attend these programs. The programs that were in the control group failed. This is set them up to fail. Go to these programs or face legal repercussions, but also go and they will most likely continue in offender behavior and be further sanctioned as a program failure.

Given the problems associated with recidivism and the need to rehabilitate the offender, it is imperative to understand the link between collaboration and program effectiveness. This research set out to answer the question: “Does collaboration increase program effectiveness?”

The analysis of collaboration and program effectiveness indicate that collaboration shows promise for improving program effectiveness. The change in scores from initial to follow up show a change toward the positive for the four programs that received collaboration and little net change for the four that did not receive collaboration. On an individual basis, each of the four that received collaboration registered an increase in the CPAI score; the smallest increase was +11.4 and the largest increase was +28. Those score increases were significant; especially in light of the scores indicate the level of likelihood of recidivating for youth offenders.

It is the hope of this researcher that offender programs whether for youths or adults will move toward collaboration as a rule. This can be through policy or funding requirements.

References

- Andrews, D. A., Zinger, I., Hoge, R. D., Bonta, J., Gendreau, P., & Cullen, F. T. (1990). Does correctional treatment work? A clinically relevant and informed meta-analysis. *Criminology* , 369-404.
- Flores, A. W., Russell, A. L., Latessa, E. J., & Travis, L. F. (2005). Evidence of Professionalism or Quackery: Measuring Practitioner Awareness of Risk/Need Factors and Effective Treatment Strategies. *Federal Probation* , 9-14.
- Gendreau, P., & Andrews, D. A. (1994). *Correctional Program Assessment Inventory (4th ed.)*. New Brunswick: University of New Brunswick.
- Gendreau, P., & Ross, R. (1979). The Effective Correctional Treatment: Bibliotherapy for Cynics. *Delinquency* , 463-489.
- Gendreau, P., Goggen, C., & Smith, P. (2004). Obstacles to Effective Correctional Program Delivery. *Corrections Today* , 121-142.
- Gendreau, P., Goggin, C., Cullen, F. T., & Andrews, D. A. (2000). The Effects of Community Sanctions and Incarceration on Recidivism. *Research in Brief* , 1-4.
- Gendreau, P., Little, T., & Goggen, C. (1996). A meta-analysis of the predictors of adult offender recidivism: What works. *Criminology* , 575 -607.
- Latessa, E. J., Cullen, F. T., & Gendreau, P. (2002). Beyond Correctional Quackery - Professionalism and the Possibility of Effective Treatment;. *Federal Probation* , 43 - 49.
- Palmer, T. (1975). Martinson Revisited. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* , 133-152.
- Pratt, T. C. (2009). *Addicted to incarceration, correctional policy and the politics of misinformation in the United States*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

- Reiman, J. (2007). *The rich get richer and the poor get prison*. Boston: Pearson.
- Sheldon, R., Tracy, S., & Brown, W. (2004). *Youth Gangs in American Society*. Belmont: Wadsworth.
- Snyder, H. N., & Stinchcomb, J. B. (2006). Do higher incarceration rates mean lower crime rates? *Corrections Today* , 93-97.
- Sperber, K. H.-H. (2005). Bridging the Gap Between Theory and Practice: a Call to Action. *Fedral Probation* , 79-91.
- U.S. Department of Justice. (2011). *Office of Juvenile Programs*. Retrieved March 7, 2011, from Office of Justice Programs: Juvenile Justice: <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/index.htm>
- U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2004, 6 28). *Sourcebook of criminal justice statistics Online*. Retrieved 10 28, 2009, from U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics: <http://www.albany.edu/sourcebook/pdf/t6282004.pdf>
- US department of Justice. (2011). *Office of Juvenile Programs*. Retrieved March 7, 2011, from Office of Justice Programs: Juvenile Justice: <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/index.htm>
- Walker, S., Spohn, C., & DeLone, M. (2007). *The Color of Justice*. Belmont: Wadsworth.